arXiv:1703.09755v1 [gr-qc] 28 Mar 2017

Covariant Hamiltonian formulation for MacDowell-Mansouri gravity

Jasel Berra–Montiel[1], **Alberto Molgado**[1,2] **and David Serrano-Blanco**[1]

[1] Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad Autonoma de San Luis Potosi
Av. Salvador Nava S/N Zona Universitaria, San Luis Potosi, SLP, 78290 Mexico
[2] Dual CP Institute of High Energy Physics, Mexico

E-mail: jberra@fc.uaslp.mx, molgado@fc.uaslp.mx, davidserrano@fc.uaslp.mx

Abstract. We analyse the behaviour of the MacDowell-Mansouri action with internal symmetry group $SO(4,1)$ under the covariant Hamiltonian formulation. The field equations, known in this formalism as the De Donder-Weyl equations, are obtained by means of the graded Poisson-Gerstenhaber bracket structure present within the covariant formulation. The decomposition of the internal algebra $\mathfrak{so}(4,1) \simeq \mathfrak{so}(3,1) \oplus \mathbb{R}^{3,1}$ allows the symmetry breaking $SO(4,1) \to SO(3,1)$, which reduces the original action to the Palatini action without the topological term. We demonstrate that, in contrast to the Lagrangian approach, this symmetry breaking can be performed indistinctly in the covariant Hamiltonian formalism either before or after the variation of the De Donder-Weyl Hamiltonian has been done, recovering Einstein's equations via the Poisson-Gerstenhaber bracket.

Keywords: Gravity, Multisymplectic formalism, De Donder-Weyl, Graded Poisson bracket, Gauge theory, Hamiltonian, Einstein's equations

PACS numbers: 11.10.Ef, 11.15.Kc, 04.20.Fy, 04.50.Kd,04.65.+e

AMS classification scheme numbers: 83C05 83E50 70S15 83C47 70S05

1. Introduction

The MacDowell-Mansouri model, first proposed in [1], consists in a Yang-Mills-type gauge theory with gauge group $SO(4,1)$. The relevance of this model relies in the fact that after the symmetry breaking $SO(4,1) \to SO(3,1)$ the action describing the gauge theory turns out to be classically equivalent to the standard Palatini action for General Relativity as both only differ by a topologically invariant term associated to the $SO(3,1)$-curvature whose variation vanishes. The role of this model as a theory describing General Relativity has been vastly studied from different perspectives such as its BF reformulation [2, 3], its connection with supergravity [4, 5, 6], its dual gravity formulation [7], among others (see also [8, 9, 10]).

The equivalence between the action proposed by MacDowell and Mansouri and the Palatini action is made possible by the fact that the internal Lie algebra admits the orthogonal splitting $\mathfrak{so}(4,1) \simeq \mathfrak{so}(3,1) \oplus \mathbb{R}^{3,1}$, so that the symmetry breaking is achieved by projecting the associated $\mathrm{SO}(4,1)$-connection to its $\mathrm{SO}(3,1)$ components, which turn out to be the standard Lorentz connection. As pointed out by Wise [2], a concise geometrical meaning can be given to the symmetry breaking process by identifying the $\mathrm{SO}(4,1)$ gauge field as a connection of a Cartan geometry [11, 12].

Being a theory with a strong geometric background and also physically relevant due to its relation with General Relativity, the MacDowell-Mansouri model is a perfect candidate for analysis under the inherently geometric classical formulation known as the multisymplectic formalism. Based in the early work of De Donder, Weyl, Carathéodory, among others [13, 14, 15], the multisymplectic approach for field theory consists in a covariant Hamiltonian formalism endowed with a generalization of the symplectic structure which enables to define a Poisson-like bracket. One of the key points within the multisymplectic approach relies in changing the definition of the standard Hamiltonian momenta, here considered not as variations of the Lagrangian density with respect to time derivatives of the field variables but as variations with respect to the derivatives of the fields in every spacetime direction. These new fields, known within this context as polymomenta, define a covariant Legendre transformation which associates to the Lagrangian density a new function H_{DW} called De Donder-Weyl Hamiltonian, and it dictates the dynamics of the system in the so-called polymomentum phase-space. Without a time foliation, the multisymplectic formalism provides an explicitly covariant formulation. The polymomentum phase-space is endowed with a canonical $(n+1)$-form playing the analogue role of the standard symplectic 2-form, called the multisymplectic form [16, 17, 18]. A bracket may be induced in the polymometum phase-space by this multisymplectic form, which results to be a graded generalization to the Poisson bracket, called the Poisson-Gerstenhaber bracket [18, 19, 20]. The field equations resulting out of this formalism, known as the De Donder-Weyl equations can be written in terms of the Poisson-Gerstenhaber bracket in a similar way to the standard Hamiltonian formulation for fields, but maintaining covariance explicitly at any point of the calculations.

Our main purpose in this paper is to study the symmetry breaking process in the MacDowell-Mansouri action under the multisymplectic formalism. As we will describe below, we notice a significant difference to the same process between the Lagrangian and the covariant Hamiltonian approaches. In the former, the variation of the action and the symmetry breaking do not commute thus the Lagrangian formalism is affected by the order in which we consider these two steps, while in the latter, the field equations remain invariant irrespectively of the order on which these steps are considered. This invariance at the multisymplectic level results naturally encoded by the definition of the covariant polymomenta, as it contains information on the spacetime derivatives of all of the configuration variables, which remain invariant whether or not the symmetry is broken.

This paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we review the main aspects of the

multisymplectic approach in order to set up our notation and definitions, following as close as possible references [17, 18, 24, 25, 26] in which a well behaved and intuitive framework for the covariant Hamiltonian formalism is introduced. In section 3, we introduce the MacDowell-Mansouri action following the notation developed in [1] and [2]. We describe the symmetry breaking $\mathrm{SO}(4,1) \to \mathrm{SO}(3,1)$ in detail for both, the Lagrangian and the multisymplectic formalisms. In particular, we discuss on the different manner in which the symmetry breaking has to be interpreted within each formalism. Finally, in Section 4 we include some concluding remarks.

2. Multisymplectic formalism

In this section we briefly review the multisymplectic approach to the De Donder-Weyl formalism for classical field theory [21, 16, 22, 23]. We will closely follow the work of Kanatchikov [17, 18, 24, 25, 26] on which the geometric and algebraic structures of the formalism have been vastly explored at the classical level.

Let us start by considering the fibre bundle (E, π, M), with M an n-dimensional smooth manifold with local coordinates $\{x^\mu\}_{\mu=1}^n$, E a smooth manifold of dimension m with local coordinate functions $\{y^a\}_{a=1}^m$ and $\pi : E \to M$ the standard projection map. Let $\phi : M \to E$ be a local section around a point $p \in M$, so that its local components are given by $\phi^a := y^a \circ \phi$. We will denote the space of local sections of π around the point p as $\Gamma_p(\pi)$. Now, let us define the configuration space as the first jet manifold J^1E of π, whose elements $j^1_p\phi \in J^1E$, for each point p, and every local section ϕ, have the local representation $(x^\mu, \phi^a, \phi^a_\mu)$, where $\phi^a_\mu := \partial\phi^a/\partial x^\mu$ are commonly known as the derivative coordinates [22, 27].

The dynamics of a physical system is described by the action functional $S : \Gamma_p(\pi) \to \mathbb{R}$, given in terms of the Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L} : J^1E \to \mathbb{R}$, such that $\mathcal{L}(j^1_p\phi) = \mathcal{L}(x^\mu, \phi^a, \phi^a_\mu)$, by

$$\mathcal{S}[\phi] := \int_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{L}(j^1_p\phi)\, V\,, \tag{1}$$

for any $\phi \in \Gamma_p(\pi)$, where $V := dx^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dx^n$ denotes the local volume element of M and $\mathcal{C}$ is an appropriate submanifold of M on which the integration is performed. In order to determine the local sections which effectively describe the physical behaviour of a given theory, let us define the quantities

$$\pi^\mu_a := \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \phi^a_\mu}\,, \tag{2}$$

called the *polymomenta*. The triple $(x^\mu, \phi^a, \pi^\mu_a)$ defines a local coordinate system for a new manifold $\mathcal{P}$, known in this context as the *polymomentum phase-space*. The Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L}$ is associated to a smooth function H_{DW} in $\mathcal{P}$ by the map $\mathbb{L} : C^\infty(J^1E) \longrightarrow C^\infty(\mathcal{P})$, called the *covariant Legendre transformation*, such that

$$H_{DW}(x^\mu, \phi^a, \pi^\mu_a) := \mathbb{L}(\mathcal{L}) = \pi^\mu_a\, \partial_\mu\phi^a - \mathcal{L}(x^\mu, \phi^a, \pi^\mu_a)\,, \tag{3}$$

where the symbol ∂_μ stands for the derivative with respect to the base space coordinates x^μ. The function $H_{DW} : \mathcal{P} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called the *De Donder-Weyl Hamiltonian* [16, 23].

Before we proceed, it is convenient to introduce the main geometrical objects associated to the polymomentum phase-space. Following standard notation, let $\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{P})$ be the space of all sections of the tangent bundle $T\mathcal{P}$, that is, the space of smooth vector fields. Let $T^V\mathcal{P}$ denote the *vertical tangent bundle* of $\mathcal{P}$, defined as the kernel of the pushforward of the bundle projection $\mathcal{P} \to M$, i. e., the set of vectors which are not tangent to the base space manifold [27]. The space of sections of the vertical tangent bundle, $\mathfrak{X}^V(\mathcal{P})$, will be regarded as the space of *vertical vector fields*, which in local coordinates may be written as $X = X^v\partial_v := X^a\partial_a + X^\mu_a\partial^a_\mu$, where we have adopted the notation $\partial_a := \frac{\partial}{\partial\phi^a}$ and $\partial^a_\mu := \frac{\partial}{\partial\pi^\mu_a}$ and the horizontal term is absent due to the definition above.

Now, let $\Omega^r(\mathcal{P}) := \bigwedge^r \Omega^1(\mathcal{P})$, be the space of r-forms, that is, sections of $\bigwedge^r T^*\mathcal{P}$. The subspace $\Omega^r_0(\mathcal{P}) \subset \Omega^r(\mathcal{P})$, whose elements satisfy $X \lrcorner \theta = 0$ for $\theta \in \Omega^r_0(\mathcal{P})$ and for any $X \in \mathfrak{X}^V(\mathcal{P})$, is called the space of *horizontal r-forms*. Finally, let us consider the space $\Omega^r_1(\mathcal{P}) \subset \Omega^r(\mathcal{P})$ whose elements satisfy $X \lrcorner \theta \in \Omega^{r-1}_0(\mathcal{P})$, called the space of $(r;1)$-*horizontal* forms. Its generalization, the space $\Omega^r_s(\mathcal{P}) \subset \Omega^r(\mathcal{P})$ such that its elements θ satisfy $X \lrcorner \theta \in \Omega^{r-1}_{s-1}(\mathcal{P})$ for any $X \in \mathfrak{X}^V(\mathcal{P})$ is called the space of $(r;s)$-*horizontal* forms.

As it is well known, the Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L}$, can be used to define a unique n-form associated to the first jet manifold J^1E, called the Cartan form [23, 27], given by $\Theta_L = \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\phi^a_\mu}(d\phi^a - \phi^a_\nu dx^\nu) \wedge V_\mu - \mathcal{L}V$, where $V_\mu := \partial_\mu \lrcorner V$. By means of the covariant Legendre transformation (3), the polymomentum phase-space $\mathcal{P}$ is also endowed with a canonical n-form induced from Θ_L with the local representation

$$\Theta_{DW} = \pi^\mu_a\, d\phi^a \wedge V_\mu - H_{DW}V\,, \tag{4}$$

known as the *Poincaré-Cartan form* [19, 21, 28, 29]. This local representation explicitly shows the decomposition of Θ_{DW} into two terms, its vertical and horizontal parts, respectively. As it has been shown before, the dynamics of a physical system may be encoded only in the vertical term of the Poincaré-Cartan form [16, 21, 30, 31]. In consequence, we will only consider the $(n;1)$-horizontal form $\Theta^V_{DW} \in \Omega^n_1(\mathcal{P})$ corresponding to the first term of (4), as the second term corresponds to a purely horizontal form. Now, given an arbitrary p-form in the polymomentum phase-space, namely, $\overset{p}{F} = \frac{1}{p!}F_{M_1\cdots M_p}dz^{M_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge dz^{M_p}$, where $z^M := (x^\mu, \phi^a, \pi^\mu_a)$ denotes the basis of $\mathcal{P}$, then we define its *vertical derivative* by

$$d^V\overset{p}{F} := \frac{1}{p!}\partial_v F_{M_1\cdots M_p}dz^v \wedge dz^{M_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge dz^{M_p}\,, \tag{5}$$

where $z^v := (\phi^a, \pi^\mu_a)$ stands for the vertical coordinates in $\mathcal{P}$ [17]. In this way, by taking the vertical derivative of Θ^V_{DW} we may define the $(n+1;2)$-horizontal form

$$\Omega_{DW} := d^V\Theta^V_{DW} = d\pi^\mu_a \wedge d\phi^a \wedge V_\mu\,, \tag{6}$$

called the *multisymplectic form* [18, 20]. This $(n+1)$-form defines an analogue of the usual symplectic structure in the polymomentum phase-space. We aim to define the geometrical objects which, contracted with the multisymplectic form (6), maintain vertical information. With this in mind, let $\overset{p}{X} = \frac{1}{p!} X^{\nu\mu_1\cdots\mu_{p-1}} \partial_\nu \wedge \partial_{\mu_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \partial_{\mu_{p-1}}$, with $0 < p \leq n$, be a *vertical multivector field* of degree p, [19, 29, 32]. We will call $\overset{p}{X}$ a *Hamiltonian* multivector field, if there exists a unique $(n-p;0)$-horizontal form $\overset{n-p}{F}$ satisfying

$$\overset{p}{X} \lrcorner\, \Omega_{DW} = d^V \overset{n-p}{F} . \tag{7}$$

If this last condition is satisfied, then $\overset{n-p}{F}$ is called the *Hamiltonian form* associated to the Hamiltonian multivector field $\overset{p}{X}$. This pairing between Hamiltonian forms and Hamiltonian fields induced from the multisymplectic form Ω_{DW}, endows the polymomentum phase-space $\mathcal{P}$ with a graded Poisson structure. Let $\overset{p}{F} \in \Omega^p_0(\mathcal{P})$, and $\overset{q}{G} \in \Omega^q_0(\mathcal{P})$ be Hamiltonian forms and $\overset{n-p}{X}_F$, and $\overset{n-q}{X}_G$ their respective Hamiltonian fields. The map $\{\![\, \cdot, \cdot \,]\!\colon \Omega^p_0(\mathcal{P}) \times \Omega^q_0(\mathcal{P}) \longrightarrow \Omega^{p+q-n+1}_0(\mathcal{P})$ given by

$$\{\![\, \overset{p}{F}, \overset{q}{G} \,]\!] := (-1)^{n-p} \overset{n-p}{X}_F \lrcorner\, \overset{n-q}{X}_G \lrcorner\, \Omega_{DW} , \tag{8}$$

is called the *Poisson-Gerstenhaber Bracket* [17, 18, 32]. Due to the degree corresponding to the contraction $\lrcorner$ of the right hand of (8), the Poisson-Gerstenhaber bracket is only defined for $p + q \geq n - 1$. The commutation rule for this bracket is given by $\{\![\, \overset{p}{F}, \overset{q}{G} \,]\!] = -(-1)^{|F||G|} \{\![\, \overset{q}{G}, \overset{p}{F} \,]\!]$, where $|F| := n - p - 1$ and $|G| := n - q - 1$ are the degrees of the horizontal forms $\overset{p}{F}$ and $\overset{q}{G}$ with respect to the Poisson-Gerstenhaber bracket. In consequence, this bracket structure results graded-commutative. This allows to define the canonical commutation relations for canonical variables by [17]

$$\{\![\, \pi^\mu_a V_\mu, \phi^b \,]\!] = \delta^b_a , \qquad \{\![\, \pi^\mu_a V_\mu, \phi^b V_\nu \,]\!] = \delta^b_a V_\nu , \qquad \{\![\, \pi^\mu_a, \phi^b V_\nu \,]\!] = \delta^b_a \delta^\mu_\nu . \tag{9}$$

As a consequence of the graded-commutativity of the Gerstenhaber bracket, it satisfies the graded Jacobi identity $\{\![\, \overset{p}{F}, \{\![\, \overset{q}{G}, \overset{r}{H} \,]\!] \,]\!] = \{\![\, \{\![\, \overset{p}{F}, \overset{q}{G} \,]\!], \overset{r}{H} \,]\!] + (-1)^{|F||G|} \{\![\, \overset{q}{G}, \{\![\, \overset{p}{F}, \overset{r}{H} \,]\!] \,]\!]$. Finally, the Gerstenhaber bracket satisfies a graded Leibniz rule

$$\{\![\, \overset{p}{F}, \overset{q}{G} \bullet \overset{r}{H} \,]\!] = \{\![\, \overset{p}{F}, \overset{q}{G} \,]\!] \bullet \overset{r}{H} + (-1)^{(n-q)|F|} \overset{q}{G} \bullet \{\![\, \overset{p}{F}, \overset{r}{H} \,]\!] , \tag{10}$$

where the map $\bullet : \Omega^p_0(\mathcal{P}) \times \Omega^q_0(\mathcal{P}) \longrightarrow \Omega^{p+q-n}_0(\mathcal{P})$, called the *co-exterior product*, is given by

$$\overset{p}{F} \bullet \overset{q}{G} := *^{-1}(*\overset{p}{F} \wedge *\overset{q}{G}) , \tag{11}$$

with $*$ being the Hodge dual defined over M. Equation (10), together with the commutation rule and the graded Jacobi identity make (8) a graded-Poisson bracket. The co-exterior product induces a derivative operator called the *total co-exterior differential* over horizontal forms [17, 18]. Let $\overset{p}{F} = \frac{1}{(n-p)!} F^{\mu_1\cdots\mu_{n-p}} (\partial_{\mu_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \partial_{\mu_{n-p}}) \lrcorner\, V$, be a horizontal p-form, then, its co-exterior differential is defined as

$$\mathrm{d} \bullet \overset{p}{F} := \frac{1}{(n-p)!} \partial_\nu F^{\mu_1\cdots\mu_{n-p}} \partial_\mu z^\nu \, dx^\mu \bullet (\partial_{\mu_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \partial_{\mu_{n-p}}) \lrcorner\, V + d^h \bullet \overset{p}{F} , \tag{12}$$

where the last term is called the *horizontal co-exterior differential* of $\overset{p}{F}$, namely,

$$d^h \bullet \overset{p}{F} = \frac{1}{(n-p)!}\partial_\mu F^{\mu_1\cdots\mu_{n-p}} dx^\mu \bullet (\partial_{\mu_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \partial_{\mu_{n-p}}) \lrcorner V\,. \tag{13}$$

By means of equation (7) and the definition of the Gerstenhaber bracket (8), the co-exterior differential of a Hamiltonian form $\overset{p}{F}$ can be written as

$$\mathrm{d} \bullet \overset{p}{F} = -\sigma(-1)^n \{\!\![H_{DW}, \overset{p}{F}]\!\!\} + d^h \bullet \overset{p}{F}\,, \tag{14}$$

where $\sigma = \pm 1$ depends on the signature of the metric of the base space manifold M, $+1$ for Euclidean and -1 for Minkowski. Using the canonical commutation relations (9), we obtain the equations of motion

$$\partial_\mu \phi^a = \{\!\![H_{DW}, \phi^a V_\mu]\!\!\} = \frac{\partial H_{DW}}{\partial \pi^\mu_a}\,, \qquad \partial_\mu \pi^\mu_a = \{\!\![H_{DW}, \pi^\mu_a V_\mu]\!\!\} = -\frac{\partial H_{DW}}{\partial \phi^a}\,, \tag{15}$$

known within this formalism as the *De Donder-Weyl equations* [22]. A direct calculation involving the definition of the De Donder-Weyl Hamiltonian can be used to show the equivalence between equations (15) and the Euler-Lagrange field equations if the Lagrangian density satisfies the *non-singular* condition $\det\left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial \phi^a_\mu \partial \phi^b_\nu}\right) \neq 0$ [16, 23]. Even though this will not be our case, a judiciously definition of the polymomenta will allow us to avoid the standard treatment for constraints, as described below.

3. MacDowell-Mansouri gravity

In this section we give a brief description of the system we will work with using the multisymplectic formalism. We will first introduce the MacDowell-Mansouri action and the relation it has with the Palatini action for gravity via a symmetry braking of the gauge group $\mathrm{SO}(4,1)$. We will then treat the model under the multisymplectic formalism, closely focusing in the symmetry breaking process in the covariant Hamiltonian approach.

3.1. Lagrangian formalism

The MacDowell-Mansouri action is based on a gauge theory with gauge group $\mathrm{SO}(4,1)$ [1], such that its correspondent Lie algebra admits the decomposition as vector spaces

$$\mathfrak{so}(4,1) \simeq \mathfrak{so}(3,1) \oplus \mathbb{R}^{3,1}\,. \tag{16}$$

Now, let M be the smooth base space manifold for the theory, and let the Lie algebra-valued 1-form, $A \in \mathfrak{so}(4,1) \otimes \Omega^1(M)$, be the associated $\mathrm{SO}(4,1)$-connection, regarded as the gauge field. Decomposition (16) splits the gauge field A into an $\mathrm{SO}(3,1)$-connection ω and a *coframe field* e, such that

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \omega & \frac{1}{l}e \\ -\frac{1}{l}e & 0 \end{pmatrix}\,, \tag{17}$$

where l is a constant chosen with units of length to be later related with the cosmological constant $\Lambda > 0$. The coframe field e is just the bundle morphism which makes the following diagram commutative, namely,



where τ is the canonical tangent bundle projection, $\mathcal{T}$ is regarded as the internal space fibre bundle with local trivialization $\mathcal{T} = M \times \mathbb{R}^{3,1}$ and π stands for its natural projection [2]. This coframe field induces a metric g over the tangent bundle TM by pulling back the metric η of the internal space $\mathcal{T}$ such that $g = \eta(eu, ev)$ for any two vectors $u, v \in TM$.

The most relevant property of the gauge potential A, is that the associated gauge curvature $R = \mathrm{d}_A A := \mathrm{d}A + A \wedge A$ also splits into an $\mathfrak{so}(3,1)$-valued 2-form $F = \mathrm{d}_\omega \omega - \frac{1}{l^2} e \wedge e$ and the $\mathbb{R}^{3,1}$-valued 2-form $\mathrm{d}_\omega e$, where symbolically $\mathrm{d}_\omega := \mathrm{d} + \omega\wedge$ stands for the SO(3, 1)-gauge covariant exterior derivative, such that

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} F & \mathrm{d}_\omega e \\ -\mathrm{d}_\omega e & 0 \end{pmatrix} . \tag{18}$$

In this way, the general MacDowell-Mansouri action with local gauge group SO(4, 1), is given by

$$\mathcal{S}[A] = \int_{\mathcal{C}} \mathrm{tr}\,(R \wedge \star R) \ , \tag{19}$$

where the Hodge dual operator $\star$ and the trace are both to be taken with respect to the internal vector space $\mathfrak{so}(4,1)$.‡ The MacDowell-Mansouri model for gravity is obtained by considering the projection of the curvature R into the subalgebra $\mathfrak{so}(3,1)$, resulting in the action

$$\mathcal{S}_{MM}[\omega, e] = \int_{\mathcal{C}} \mathrm{tr}\,(F \wedge \star F) \ , \tag{20}$$

where, abusing notation, the Hodge dual and the trace are to be understood as acting within $\mathfrak{so}(3,1)$. It is relevant to notice that, by taking the projection of R, we have broken the SO(4, 1) symmetry down to SO(3, 1). The variation of the action (20) with respect to the fields ω and e, results in the equations of motion

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{d}_\omega F &= 0 \,, \\ e \wedge F &= 0 \,, \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

respectively. The first equation, using the definition of F, implies that $\mathrm{d}_\omega(e \wedge e) = 0$, which is the torsion-free condition. The second expression in (21) written in terms of the SO(3, 1)-curvature $\hat{R} := \mathrm{d}_\omega \omega$, and fixing the constant l in terms of the cosmological constant as $l^2 = 3/\Lambda$, yields the equation

$$e \wedge \hat{R} - \frac{\Lambda}{3} e \wedge e \wedge e = 0 \,, \tag{22}$$

‡ This Hodge dual operator $\star$ must not be confused with $*$, appearing in section 2, which stands for the Hodge dual operator defined over M.

which is the coordinate free expression for Einstein's equations of gravity in terms of the connection 1-form ω and the coframe e. The fact that the action $\mathcal{S}_{MM}$ results in a classical description of vierbein gravity, is due to the relation of (20) with the Palatini action

$$\mathcal{S}_{Pal} = \int_{\mathcal{C}} \mathrm{tr}\left(F \wedge \star F + \hat{R} \wedge \star \hat{R}\right) , \tag{23}$$

in such a way that $\mathcal{S}_{Pal} = \mathcal{S}_{MM} + T$, where T stands for the topologically invariant term $\int \mathrm{tr}(\hat{R} \wedge \star \hat{R})$, whose variation classically vanishes.

It is worth pointing out that a gravitational theory with cosmological constant term is obtained from (19) only after breaking the SO(4, 1)-symmetry, as the variation of the original action gives the field equation $\mathrm{d}_A R = 0$ which, upon the decomposition (18), results in the pair of equations

$$\mathrm{d}_\omega F + \frac{1}{l^2} e \wedge \mathrm{d}_\omega e = 0 \,, \qquad \mathrm{d}_\omega^2 e = 0 \,, \tag{24}$$

for the $\mathfrak{so}(3, 1)$ and $\mathbb{R}^{3,1}$ sectors, respectively. After breaking the SO(4, 1) symmetry by projecting $\mathrm{d}_A R = 0$ down to the $\mathfrak{so}(3, 1)$ sector, the resulting equation of motion is the first expression in (24), thus not recovering Einstein's equations, namely, $e \wedge F = 0$. In other words, by breaking the SO(4, 1)-symmetry after the variation has been performed, the field equations for gravity cannot be recovered from the original action (24). This fact might be better understood by realizing that $\mathrm{d}_\omega F + \frac{1}{l^2} e \wedge \mathrm{d}_\omega e = 0$ can be obtained by the variation of the inequivalent action

$$S[\omega] = \int_{\mathcal{C}} \mathrm{tr}\left(\hat{R} \wedge \star \hat{R} - \frac{1}{l^2} e \wedge e \wedge \star \hat{R}\right) , \tag{25}$$

with respect to the field ω, contrary to the action (20) which depends on both field variables ω and e. As we will see below, the multisymplectic formalism behaves in a substantially different way under the symmetry breaking process due to the intrinsic definition of the polymomenta (2).

3.2. De Donder-Weyl formulation

In this section we will apply the multisymplectic formalism to the MacDowell-Mansouri action with SO(4, 1)-gauge symmetry. We will start by writing the action (19) in local coordinates. Let $X_{IJ} \in \mathfrak{so}(4, 1)$ be the generators of the correspondent $\mathfrak{so}(4, 1)$ algebra, with $I = \{0, \ldots 4\}$. In this way, the connection A is given by $A = A_\mu^{IJ} dx^\mu \otimes X_{IJ}$, and the curvature R takes the form $R = \frac{1}{2} R_{\mu\nu}^{IJ}\, dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu \otimes X_{IJ}$ such that its components are given by definition, as

$$R_{\mu\nu}^{IJ} = 2\partial_{[\mu} A_{\nu]}^{IJ} + A_{[\mu K}^{I} A_{\nu]}^{KJ} \,, \tag{26}$$

with $\partial_{[\mu} A_{\nu]}^{IJ} = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu A_\nu^{IJ} - \partial_\nu A_\mu^{IJ})$ denoting the antisymmetrization, and the internal contraction in the second term given by the $\mathfrak{so}(4, 1)$-metric $\eta_{IJ} := \mathrm{diag}(-1, 1, 1, 1, 1)_{IJ}$. Now, we will consider the action of the internal Hodge dual $\star$ as obtained through multiplication by $-Q_{IJKL}$, where these constants explicitly read

$$Q_{IJKL} := \frac{1}{2}(\eta_{IK}\eta_{JL} - \eta_{IL}\eta_{JK}) \,. \tag{27}$$

In this way, the action (19) takes the local form

$$\mathcal{S}[A] = -\frac{1}{4}\int_{\mathcal{C}} R^{IJ}_{\mu\nu} R^{KL}_{\rho\sigma} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} Q_{IJKL}\, V\,, \tag{28}$$

where the ϵ is the usual Levi-Civita alternating symbol for the base space manifold M. Following (2), the associated polymomenta are given by

$$\Pi^{\mu\nu}_{IJ} = -\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} Q_{IJKL} R^{KL}_{\rho\sigma}\,. \tag{29}$$

Noticing that $Q^{IJMN}Q_{IJKL} = \delta^M_{[K}\delta^N_{L]}$, and using (26), we can write the antisymmetric derivatives of A in terms of the polymomenta, thus we have that $\partial_{[\mu}A^{IJ}_{\nu]} = -\frac{1}{8}\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}Q^{IJKL}\Pi^{\rho\sigma}_{KL} - \frac{1}{2}A^I_{[\mu M}A^{MJ}_{\nu]}$. From the definition of the polymomenta, we also may see that the symmetric part vanishes, thus implying the presence of constraints $\Pi^{(\mu\nu)}_{IJ} \approx 0$. A straightforward calculation shows that the polymomenta associated to the symmetric derivatives of the connection also result divergenceless and, as demonstrated in [33], within the multisymplectic formalism one may redefine the polymomenta in order to circumvent the presence of any symmetric part, thus avoiding the standard treatment for constraints in the symmetric sector of the configuration space.

Then, the De Donder-Weyl Hamiltonian (3), takes the local form

$$H_{DW} = -\frac{1}{16}\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}Q^{IJKL}\Pi^{\mu\nu}_{IJ}\Pi^{\rho\sigma}_{KL} - \frac{1}{2}\Pi^{\mu\nu}_{IJ}A^I_{[\mu K}A^{KJ}_{\nu]}\,, \tag{30}$$

and the De Donder-Weyl equations (15) for this Hamiltonian read

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_\mu A^{IJ}_\nu &= \{\![\, H_{DW}, A^{IJ}_\nu V_\mu \,]\!\} = -\frac{1}{8}\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}Q^{IJKL}\Pi^{\rho\sigma}_{KL} - \frac{1}{2}A^I_{[\mu M}A^{MJ}_{\nu]}\,,\\
\partial_\mu \Pi^{\mu\nu}_{IJ} &= \{\![\, H_{DW}, \Pi^{\mu\nu}_{IJ} V_\mu \,]\!\} = -A^K_{\mu[I}\Pi^{\mu\nu}_{J]K}\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

where the first expression results an identity from the definition of the polymomenta (29). Notice that both equations reduce to $\mathrm{d}_A R = 0$ when substituted one into the other, demonstrating the equivalence from the De Donder-Weyl and Lagrangian field equations.

Now, we proceed with the decomposition (16) without breaking the $\mathrm{SO}(4,1)$-symmetry, that is, considering all the components of A and Π. Let us consider the set of indices for the internal subalgebra $\mathfrak{so}(3,1)$, as the lower case Latin indices $a := \{0,\dots,3\}$, such that $I = \{a, 4\}$. From relation (17), we may define the local components of the connection A by

$$\omega^a_{\mu\, b} := A^a_{\mu\, b}\,, \qquad \frac{1}{l}e^a_\mu := A^a_{\mu\, 4}\,, \tag{32}$$

where the antisymmetry of the connection A implies that $\frac{1}{l}e_{\mu\, a} = -A^4_{\mu\, a}$. In a similar fashion, the decomposition of the internal space induces a splitting of the components of the polymomenta, thus let us define

$$\pi^{\mu\nu}_{ab} := \Pi^{\mu\nu}_{ab}\,, \qquad \frac{1}{l}p^{\mu\nu}_a := \Pi^{\mu\nu}_{a\, 4}\,. \tag{33}$$

Also, the decomposition of the constants Q_{IJKL}, from definition (27), satisfy $Q_{abc4} = 0$ and $Q_{a4b4} = \frac{1}{2}\eta_{ab}$, while the rest vanish. In this way, we can explicitly write the decomposition of the De Donder-Weyl equations by fixing indices in both (31), such that the $\mathfrak{so}(3,1)$ part is obtained with $I = a$ and $J = b$, and the $\mathbb{R}^{3,1}$ part with $I = a$ and $J = 4$. The former index fixing, using the definitions (32) and (33), yields the equations

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^{\mu\nu}_{ab} &= -\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} Q_{abcd} \left(2\partial_{[\rho}\omega^{cd}_{\sigma]} + \omega^{c}_{[\rho\, i}\omega^{id}_{\sigma]} - \frac{1}{l^2} e^{c}_{[\rho} e^{d}_{\sigma]} \right) , \\ \partial_\mu \pi^{\mu\nu}_{ab} &= -\omega^{c}_{\mu[a}\pi^{\mu\nu}_{b]c} + \frac{1}{l^2} e_{\mu[a} p^{\mu\nu}_{b]} , \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

and in a similar way, the $\mathbb{R}^{3,1}$ part results in

$$\begin{aligned} p^{\mu\nu}_{a} &= -\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \eta_{ab} \left(2\partial_{[\rho} e^{b}_{\sigma]} + \omega^{b}_{[\rho\, c} e^{c}_{\sigma]} \right) , \\ 2\partial_\mu p^{\mu\nu}_{a} &= \omega^{b}_{\mu\, a} p^{\mu\nu}_{b} - e^{c}_{\mu} \pi^{\mu\nu}_{ac} . \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

Substituting the first line in (34) into the second line, and by using the definition of the projection F (18) of the curvature R into $\mathfrak{so}(3,1)$, we obtain the relation

$$\mathrm{d}_\omega F^{ab} = \frac{1}{l^2} e^a \wedge (\mathrm{d}_\omega e)^b , \tag{36}$$

and in a similar way, by substituting the first line in (35) into the second line, and by using (18), we arrive at the expression

$$\mathrm{d}_\omega (\mathrm{d}_\omega e)^a = -e^b \wedge F^a{}_b . \tag{37}$$

Equations (36) and (37) may be thought of as a result of the structural Cartan equations [11, 12]. It is relevant to notice that this last equation differs from the second Lagrangian field equation in (21) in an important way. To see this clearly, let us note that the SO(4, 1)-symmetry breaking in this formalism is achieved by requiring that $p^{\mu\nu}_a = 0$, which is equivalent to taking only the projection F of R in the Lagrangian approach. With this condition, the De Donder-Weyl equations, (36) and (37), read $\mathrm{d}_\omega F^{ab} = 0$ and $e^b \wedge F^a{}_b = 0$, respectively, which turn out to be exactly the field equations for the SO(3, 1) MacDowell-Mansouri action, (20). This means that, in contrast to the Lagrangian approach, the De Donder-Weyl formalism appears to allow the symmetry breaking after the variation of H_{DW} has been done and still reproduce the same dynamics. At first glance this could sound contradictory due to the fact that the De Donder-Weyl equations are equivalent to the Euler-Lagrange field equations, as in this particular model, for the reasons we have explained, this seems not to be the case. There is, however, a simple but quite interesting aspect of the De Donder-Weyl formulation which explains this discrepancy with the Lagrangian approach. The polymomenta (2) can be defined as the variation of the action (19) with respect to the derivative coordinates ϕ^a_μ or, for this particular model, with respect to $\partial_\mu \omega^{ab}_\nu$ and $\partial_\mu e^a_\nu$. Thus, by breaking the SO(4, 1) symmetry in (34) and (35), the intrinsic variation

with respect to both variables present in the polymomenta remains after taking the projection down to $\mathfrak{so}(3,1)$, while in the Lagrangian case, when we broke the symmetry in the equation $\mathrm{d}_A R = 0$, the variation with respect to the field $\partial_\mu e^a_\nu$ is lost in the process, thus, giving different equations, namely, (24), corresponding to the variation of the inequivalent action (25). For these reasons, in the multisymplectic formalism, the De Donder-Weyl equations result invariant if the symmetry breaking process is performed before or after the variation of the De Donder-Weyl Hamiltonian. Indeed, by considering the De-Donder Weyl Hamiltonian (30), decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned} H_{DW} = & -\frac{1}{16}\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\epsilon^{ijab}\epsilon_{ij}{}^{cd}\pi^{\mu\nu}_{ab}\pi^{\rho\sigma}_{cd} - \frac{1}{2}\pi^{\mu\nu}_{ab}\left(\omega^a_{[\mu\,c}\omega^{cb}_{\nu]} - \frac{1}{l^2}e^a_{[\mu}e^b_{\nu]}\right) \\ & - \frac{1}{8l^2}\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\eta^{ab}p^{\mu\nu}_a p^{\rho\sigma}_b - \frac{1}{l^2}p^{\mu\nu}_a\omega^a_{[\mu\,b}e^b_{\nu]}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

where we have used the fact that $Q^{abcd} = \epsilon^{ijab}\epsilon_{ij}{}^{cd}$, we now can first apply the symmetry breaking and then variate the SO(3, 1) Hamiltonian. In order to obtain the equations of motion from the decomposed Hamiltonian (38), we first need to determine which fields stand as canonical variables. To do so, we use the commutation relations for the Poisson-Gerstenhaber bracket (9) for the SO(4, 1) Hamiltonian (30), namely,

$$\begin{aligned} \{\![\, \Pi^{\mu\nu}_{IJ}V_\nu, A^{KL}_\rho \,]\!\} &= \delta^\mu_\rho\delta^K_I\delta^L_J\,, \\ \{\![\, \Pi^{\mu\nu}_{IJ}V_\nu, A^{KL}_\rho V_\sigma \,]\!\} &= \delta^\mu_\rho\delta^K_I\delta^L_J V_\sigma\,, \\ \{\![\, \Pi^{\mu\nu}_{IJ}, A^{KL}_\rho V_\sigma \,]\!\} &= \delta^\mu_\rho\delta^\nu_\sigma\delta^K_I\delta^L_J\,, \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

and again, by fixing indices for the $\mathfrak{so}(3,1)$ and the $\mathbb{R}^{3,1}$ parts, and using the variables defined in (32) and (33), we obtain the commutation relations

$$\begin{aligned} &\{\![\, \pi^{\mu\nu}_{ab}V_\nu, \omega^{cd}_\rho \,]\!\} = \delta^\mu_\rho\delta^c_a\delta^d_b\,, && \{\![\, p^{\mu\nu}_a V_\nu, e^b_\rho \,]\!\} = \delta^\mu_\rho\delta^b_a\,, \\ &\{\![\, \pi^{\mu\nu}_{ab}V_\nu, \omega^{cd}_\rho V_\sigma \,]\!\} = \delta^\mu_\rho\delta^c_a\delta^d_b V_\sigma\,, && \{\![\, p^{\mu\nu}_a V_\nu, e^b_\rho V_\sigma \,]\!\} = \delta^\mu_\rho\delta^b_a V_\sigma\,, \\ &\{\![\, \pi^{\mu\nu}_{ab}, \omega^{cd}_\rho V_\sigma \,]\!\} = \delta^\mu_\rho\delta^\nu_\sigma\delta^c_a\delta^d_b\,, && \{\![\, p^{\mu\nu}_a, e^b_\rho V_\sigma \,]\!\} = \delta^\mu_\rho\delta^\nu_\sigma\delta^b_a\,, \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

which show that the pairs (ω, π) and (e, p) assume the role of canonical variables with respect to the Poisson-Gerstenhaber bracket after the decomposition of the internal algebra. Now, if we break the symmetry at this point by imposing once again $p^\mu_a = 0$, then the SO(3, 1) De Donder-Weyl Hamiltonian consist only of the first line of (38), and thus, the De Donder-Weyl equations for this case are given by

$$\partial_\mu\omega^{ab}_\nu = \{\![\, H_{DW}, \omega^{ab}_\nu V_\mu \,]\!\} = -\frac{1}{8}\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}Q^{abcd}\pi^{\rho\sigma}_{cd} - \frac{1}{2}\left(\omega^a_{[\mu\,c}\omega^{cb}_{\nu]} - \frac{1}{l^2}e^a_{[\mu}e^b_{\nu]}\right)\,, \tag{41}$$

$$\partial_\mu\pi^{\mu\nu}_{ab} = \{\![\, H_{DW}, \pi^{\mu\nu}_{ab} V_\mu \,]\!\} = -\omega^c_{\mu[a}\pi^{\mu\nu}_{b]c}\,, \tag{42}$$

$$0 = \{\![\, H_{DW}, p^a_\nu V_\mu \,]\!\} = -e^c_\mu\pi^{\mu\nu}_{ac}\,, \tag{43}$$

which, after explicitly writing them in terms of F, reduce to (21), giving the same dynamics as before. In contrast to the Lagrangian approach, the De Donder-Weyl formalism allows to break the SO(4, 1) symmetry either before or after determining the equations of motion. As we have mentioned above, the multisymplectic formalism allows to explicitly maintain the invariance of the De Donder-Weyl Hamiltonian under the symmetry breaking due to the definition of the polymomenta.

4. Conclusions

One of the main reasons why the multisymplectic formalism gives an interesting approach to apply to physical models is its intrinsic covariant structure which easily fits systems containing strong geometric background. Although the foundations for this formalism were introduced almost a century ago, the addition of a Poisson structure to the multisymplectic approach and also its application to compelling physical systems result relatively new, as only a few concrete examples using this method have been developed. In this sense, one of our major motivations for this paper was to extend the repertoire of physically relevant models studied under this covariant Hamiltonian approach. In particular, we analysed the well-known MacDowell-Mansouri model for gravity, for which we developed both the Lagrangian and multisymplectic formulations. At both levels, we found the correspondent equations of motion. As we have shown throughout our analysis, the inherently covariant nature of the polymomenta resulted completely relevant in order to study the symmetry breaking process within the multisymplectic formalism. Indeed, at the Lagrangian level the variational process does not commute with the symmetry breaking $\mathrm{SO}(4,1) \to \mathrm{SO}(3,1)$, resulting in two inequivalent set of field equations, namely (21) and (24), which were obtained by performing these two processes in different order. However, within the multisymplectic approach we noticed that the symmetry breaking leaves invariant the emerging De Donder-Weyl equations that follow from the Poisson-Gerstenhaber bracket. To understand this, we noticed that the symmetry breaking at the multisymplectic level includes variations with respect to all the polymomenta, and these polymomenta precisely include spacetime derivatives of the fields in each of the sectors in which the gauge algebra $\mathfrak{so}(4,1)$ is decomposed. As discussed above, this is not the case at the Lagrangian level.

The fact that the De Donder-Weyl Hamiltonian preserves the information of the variation of the action in a completely covariant manner encourages the analysis of some other physical models within the multisymplectic approach. A natural question in this direction is to address whether other similar models with broken symmetry may behave in an analogous way to the MacDowell-Mansouri gravity model, thus, the results presented in this paper could also serve as a starting point to study the behaviour of physical models on which a symmetry breaking process takes place.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Eslava del Río for collaboration and discussions. AM acknowledges financial support from CONACYT-Mexico under project CB-2014-243433.

References

[1] S. W. MacDowell and F. Mansouri, *Unified geometric theory of gravity and supergravity*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **38**, 739–742 (1977).

[2] D. K. Wise, *MacDowell-Mansouri gravity and Cartan geometry*, Class. Quantum Grav. **27** 155010 (2010), arXiv:gr-qc/0611154v2.
[3] L. Freidel and A. Starodubtsev, *Quantum gravity in terms of topological observables* (2005), arXiv:hep-th/0501191.
[4] J. A. Nieto, O. Obregon and J. Socorro, *The Gauge theory of the de Sitter group and Ashtekar formulation*, Phys. Rev. D **50**, R3583 (1994) arXiv:gr-qc/9402029.
[5] J. A. Nieto, *Superfield Description of a Self-Dual Supergravity a la MacDowell-Mansouri*, Class. Quant. Grav. **23**, 4387–4398 (2006).
[6] A. H. Chamseddine, *Massive supergravity from spontaneously breaking orthosymplectic gauge symmetry*, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **113**, 212 (1978).
[7] H. Garcia-Compean, O. Obregon, C. Ramirez and M. Sabido, *Noncommutative self-dual gravity*, Phys. Rev. D **68** (4) 044015 (2003).
[8] P. C. West, *A geometric gravity Lagrangian* Phys. Lett. B **76**, 569 (1978);
[9] H. R. Pagels, *Gravitational gauge fields and the cosmological constant*, Phys. Rev. D **29**, 1690 (1984).
[10] S. Gotzes and A. C. Hirshfeld, *A geometric formulation of the SO(3,2) theory of gravity*, Ann. Phys. **203**, 410 (1990).
[11] D. V. Alekseevsky and P. W. Michor, *Differential geometry of Cartan connections*, Publ. Math. Debrecen **47**, 349–375 (1995).
[12] S. Kobayashi, *On connections of Cartan*, Canad. J. Math. **8**, 145–156 (1956).
[13] T. De Donder, *Theorie Invariantive du Calcul des Variations*, Nuov. ed. (Gauthier- Villars, Paris, 1935).
[14] H. Weyl, *Geodesic fields in the calculus of variations*, Ann. Math. (2) **36**, 607-629 (1935).
[15] C. Carathéodory, *Über die Extremalen und geodätischen Felder in der Variationsrechnung der mehrfachen Integrale*, Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) **4**, 193-216 (1929).
[16] M. J. Gotay, *A multisymplectic framework for classical field theory and the calculus of variations I. Covariant Hamiltonian formalism, in Mechanics*, Analysis and Geometry: 200 Years after Lagrange, ed. M. Francaviglia, 203–235 (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1991).
[17] I.V. Kanatchikov, *On the Canonical structure of the De Donder-Weyl covariant Hamiltonian formulation of field theory I. Graded Poisson brackets and the equations of motion*, Aachen preprint, PITHA 93/41 (1993) arXiv:hep-th/9312162.
[18] I.V. Kanatchikov, *On field theoretic generalizations of a Poisson algebra*, Rep. Math. Phys. **40** 225–234 (1997), arXiv:hep-th/9710069.
[19] M. Forger and L. G. Gomes, *Multisymplectic and Polysymplectic Structures on Fiber Bundles*, Rev. Math. Phys. **25** (2013) 1350018, arXiv:0708.1586.
[20] C. Günther, *The polysymplectic Hamiltonian formalism in field theory and calculus of variations I: The local case*, J. Diff. Geom. **25**, 23–53 (1987).
[21] H. A. Kastrup, *Canonical theories of Lagrangian dynamical systems in Physics*, Phys. Rep. **101**, 1–167 (1983).
[22] G. Giachetta, L. Mangiarotti and G. Sardanashvily, *New Lagrangian and Hamiltonian methods in field theory* (World Scientific, 1997).
[23] G. Giachetta, L. Mangiarotti and G. Sardanashvily, *Advanced Classical field theory* (World Scientific, 2009).
[24] I. V. Kanatchikov, *Precanonical quantization and the Schrödinger wave functional*, Phys. Lett. **A283**, 25–36 (2001) arXiv:hep-th/0012084.
[25] I. V. Kanatchikov, *De Donder-Weyl theory and a hypercomplex extension of quantum mechanics to field theory*, Rep. Math. Phys. **43**, 157–70 (1999) arXiv:hep-th/9810165.
[26] I. V. Kanatchikov, *From the De Donder-Weyl Hamiltonian formalism to quantization of gravity, in: Current Topics in Mathematical Cosmology* (Proc. Int. Seminar, Potsdam, Germany, Mar 30–Apr 04, 1998) M. Rainer and H.-J. Schmidt (eds), 457-–467 (Singapore: World Scientific) arXiv:gr-qc/9810076.

[27] D. J. Saunders, *The Geometry of Jet Bundles*, London Mathematical Society lecture notes series Vol. 142 (Cambridge University Press, 1989).

[28] R. Bryant, P. Griffiths and D. Grossman, *Exterior differential systems and Euler-Lagrange partial differential equations* (University of Chicago Press, 2003).

[29] H. Goldschmidt and S. Sternberg, *The Hamilton-Cartan formalism in the calculus of variations*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **23**, fasc. 1, 203–267 (1973).

[30] J. Kijowski and W. M. Tulczyjew, *A symplectic framework for field theories*, Lecture Notes in Physics, Vol. 107 (Springer-Verlag, 1979).

[31] J. E. Cariñena, M. Crampin and L. A. Ibort, *On the multisymplectic formalism for first order field theories*, Differ. Geom. Appl. **1**, 345–374 (1991).

[32] F. Hélein and J. Kouneiher, *The Notion of Observable in the Covariant Hamiltonian Formalism for the Calculus of Variations with Several Variables*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **8**, 735–777 (2004) `arXiv:math-ph/0401047`.

[33] J. Berra-Montiel, E. del Río and A. Molgado, *Multisymplectic formulation for topologically massive Yang-Mills field theory*, `arXiv:1702.03076v1 [hep-th]`.